

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the above identified application in light of the Office Action dated January 14, 2005. Claims 1-20 remain presented for examination. Claims 1, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 18 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, in terms which distinguish over the art of record.

Claims 1, 8, 14 and 18 are the only independent claims.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious from U.S. Patent 6,408,191 (Blanchard) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0164975 (Lu).

The present invention, as defined by independent claim 1, relates to a wireless security and access device which comprises a housing and a wireless radio receiver embedded in the housing for receiving notification of an arrived electronic message. The device further comprises a processor and memory embedded in the housing for processing and storing the notification and an indicator for displaying the notification. The device also comprises a radio transmitter embedded in the housing for transmitting a preset unique radio signal, wherein the preset unique radio signal from the device is adapted to interface with a radio receiver of a personal computer preset to receive the unique radio signal.

Important features of claim 1 are the device receiving a wireless notification of an arrived electronic message and the device's capability of transmitting a preset unique radio signal to interface with a personal computer.

As understood by applicant, Blanchard relates to an arrangement for displaying message screens on a telephone terminal to provide access to messages received by the telephone terminal from a service provider. In particular, Blanchard relates to a system in which:

A message service is advantageously employed in a wireless system since a user or subscriber of a wireless telephone terminal may not be available when a caller attempts to reach him or her through a regular wireless telephone call. Through use of the messaging service, the caller is able to leave a short message that will be received by the subscriber when he or she "resurfaces" or becomes available at the telephone terminal (col. 3, lines 52-60).

Blanchard's terminal provides a means of viewing these messages.

As noted on page 3 of the Office Action, Blanchard “fails to disclose the preset unique radio signal from the wireless device is adapted to interface with a radio receiver of a personal computer.” The Office Action cites the following paragraph of Lu as teaching this feature:

By the principle of the invention, a wireless message informing system has a transmitter configured in a portable communication device such as a mobile phone and has a receiver configured in an announcing device such as a personal computer system, wherein the transmitter is coupled to the receiver electromagnetically. When the mobile phone receives a wireless signal, such as an incoming call, the transmitter transmits a triggering signal. After the receiver receives the triggering signal, the personal computer system outputs an announcing signal. For instance, the announcing signal is presented as an on screen display (OSD) or a sound produced, so as to notify the user. For the sake of simplicity, the following description will take the mobile phone as the portable communication device and the personal computer system as the announcing device because the mobile phone and the personal computer system are widely used.

Lu’s invention is directed to situations in which a computer user, who has left his cell phone away from his computer, is alerted of an incoming phone call (reference paragraphs 8 and 9). That is, in Lu, a message is received at a mobile phone 115 which contains a local transmitting device. This local transmitting device then outputs a triggering signal 120 which is received by a remote receiving device in a personal computer 130 or a speaker 140 to notify the user of the incoming call (referencing Fig 1A and paragraph 19).

Thus, in Lu notification of an incoming message is supplied to the computer. In claim 1 of the present invention notification of an incoming message is supplied to the remote device. Accordingly, applicant submits that Lu and Blanchard cannot be properly combined in a §103 rejection. That is, in Blanchard, should the initial message be received by the remote device (as Lu discloses) there is no motivation to send any remote signal to a personal computer – the message having been already received by the intended party.

Accordingly, the combination of Blanchard and Lu fails to teach or suggest the important features of claim 1: a device receiving a wireless notification of an arrived electronic message and the device’s capability of transmitting a preset unique radio signal to interface with the personal computer. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Blanchard and Lu.

Independent claim 14 is similar to claim 1 in that it also recites the device’s capability of transmitting a preset unique radio signal to interface with the personal computer. It differs from claim 1 in that it relates to notification of an arrived voicemail message. Accordingly, claim 14

is allowable over the combination of Blanchard and Lu for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Independent claims 8 and 18 also recite these features and are deemed patentable for at least the same reasons. Claim 8 recites an additional feature of the invention as well, in that “the
5 computer is preset to retrieve the electronic message upon receipt of the preset unique radio signal”. Claim 18 recites a similar feature with respect to a “voicemail message”. Blanchard clearly does not contain this feature. As noted above, this feature is incompatible with Lu’s invention as the wireless radio receiver was directly supplied the message. The inappropriateness of combining Lu with Blanchard to teach the features of the claims is even
10 more evident here: in Lu it is impossible for the computer to retrieve the message as it has never received it. For at least these reasons, claims 8 and 18 are patentable over the combination of Blanchard and Lu.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the
15 independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is
20 respectfully requested.

In particular, with respect to claim 3, applicant submits that Lu fails to teach or suggest the feature wherein the predetermined actions of the computer “include turning the personal computer on”. The Office Action’s reliance on paragraph 21 of Lu is inappropriate as this describes power supply 320 being activated. This power supply (as depicted in Figs. 2 and 3) is
25 contained in the remote transmitter (item 210), not the computer. Perhaps this confusion results from item “120” being improperly labeled in Fig. 3 as this apparently should be labeled “110” as in Fig. 2. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable over the combination of Blanchard and Lu as this combination fails to teach or suggest this feature of the invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Attorney for Application



Thomas J. Onka
Reg. No. 42,053

Synnestvedt Lechner & Woodbridge LLP
P.O. Box 592
Princeton, NJ 08542
609-924-3773 phone
609-924-1811 fax